



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
07/402,450	09/01/1989	GEORGE J. MURAKAWA	2124-154	8131
6449 7590 06/16/2009 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA				
ART UNIT 1637		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/16/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

07/402,450

Applicant(s)

MURAKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Suryaprabha Chunduru

Art Unit

1637

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 190-234 and 242-255.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Suryaprabha Chunduru/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments were found unpersuasive. First, with regard to the priority, Applicants' arguments were found unpersuasive because the '959 application discloses the fourth primer is provided as an additional aid to quantitation of virus levels in pateint samples and the reference RNA could be amplified and detected by the same the primer pair used for the authentic virus RNA samples, however the example III of the '959 application discloses that the experiment I is repeated with the addition of a primer for maxigene, which clearly indicate that the experiment III utilizes maxigene primer in addition to the primer pair that amplify the authentic virus RNA and does not disclose the use of the same primers to amplify both the target and the reference RNA (HIVA, HIVB, T-cell receptor A and B and maxigene target as a reference RNA) simultaneously. Accordingly the '959 does not support use of the same primers to amplify both virus target and reference RNA (maxigene) simultaneously.

Applicants' argue that Wang et al. dislose calculating the amount of target nucleic acid initially present in the sample before amplification step, which is not required by the instant claims 190-225, and 242-255. Applicants' arguments were found unpersuasive because claim 1 step (f) of Wang et al. disclose calculating the amplified target nucleic acid and the standard segments produced in the preceding step (d) to detect the amount of the target nucleic acid before amplification. Examiner notes that step a) of claim 1 of '727 disclose use of predetermined amount of standard RNA and does not disclose calculating target nucleic acid in the sample before amplification. If the assertion is correct, the claim 1 of '727 would not require the method steps for quantitation of target nucleic acid in a sample. With regard to the Applicants' arguments drawn to Wang et al. reference not a prior art, Applicants arguments were found unpersuasive because as discussed above, since the use of same primers lack support in the priority application, the Wang et al. reference is considered as the prior art since Wang et al. does teach use of same primers to amplify the target and the reference RNA as required by the instant claims, which recite use of same primers. With regard to the rejection of claims under obviousness rejection over Wang et al. in view of Mullis et al. Applicants' arguments were fully considered and found unpersuasive, as discussed above Wang et al. does teach use of same primers for amplifying target and the reference RNA and as discussed in the rejection, it would have been obvious to combine the method of wang et al. with the teachings of Mullis et al. Accordingly the rejections are maintained.